

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 were pending at the time of the last Office Action. Applicant has amended claims 11, 20, and 33, and canceled claims 1-10, 21-32, and 35-38. Thus, claims 11-20, 33, and 34 are now pending.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his consideration during the telephone interview of August 21, 2008. During that interview, applicant's representative described applicant's technology and discussed proposed amendments to claim 11. Applicant has further amended claim 11 as discussed during the interview.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10, 20, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claim to address the Examiner's concerns. In particular, applicant has amended claim 20 to recite a "computer-readable storage medium."

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-6, 10-16, 20, 21-26, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tarnanen. The Examiner has also rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarnanen in view of Money, claims 7-9, 17-19, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarnanen in view of Bobde, claims 31, 32, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarnanen in view of Dingman, and claims 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dingman in view of Wu. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims to clarify the claimed subject matter.

Applicants' technology relates to a system for servers to redirect client requests to other servers in order to distribute client traffic. According to one embodiment, an identified home server receives a registration request from the client and queries a client-to-home-server assignment data structure to determine with which the client is

assigned to work. If the client is not assigned to work with the present home server, the identified home server checks the number of Via headers in the registration request, which indicate how many times the message has been forwarded. Checking the number of Via headers tells the identified home server whether it is the original recipient of the registration request. If the number of Via headers is one, then a request is sent to the client redirecting the client to work with the home server. If the number of Via headers is greater than one, then the identified home server proxies the client's registration request to the home server with which the client is assigned to work.

Applicant's technology further allows watchers to set up subscriptions to watch a current server. The system monitors traffic amongst the servers and if there is a determination that a change in traffic would be beneficial (e.g. a home server crashes or must be removed from service for maintenance), a change in assignment is made. The client-to-home-server assignment data structure is modified to reflect the change and a notification is sent to the watcher so that he or she can update their subscription.

Applicant has amended each independent claim to recite checking the number of Via headers in the registration request and taking further action based on the number as described above. The claims recite "checking a number of Via headers in the registration request, the number of Via headers indicating how many times the registration request has been forwarded." The claims further recite " if the number of Via headers is one, and if the client is assigned to work with the second server, then sending a request to the client redirecting the client to work with the second server; else if the number of Via headers is greater than one, and if the client is assigned to work with the second server, then proxying the client's registration request to the second server."

In rejecting claims 11, 20, and 33, the Examiner points to Tarnanen at [0046] and [0051] as showing the limitation of "using a Via header in the registration request" (Office Action, March 25, 2008, p. 3.) In [0051], Tarnanen discloses simply displaying a

Via header, but it does not teach or suggest using the information from the Via header to redirect the client as claimed. Applicant has amended the claims to make it clear that applicant's use of the Via header includes determining how many times the registration request has been forwarded and based on that determination, redirecting or proxying the client's registration request.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8372.

Please charge any deficiencies, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268786US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 9-24-08

Respectfully submitted,

By Rachael Vaughn
Rachael Vaughn
Registration No.: 54,469
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8548
(206) 359-9000 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant